



Town of Garrett Park
PO Box 84
4600 Waverly Avenue
Garrett Park, MD 20896

Special Meeting of Town Council
Garrett Park Town Office
4600 Waverly Avenue
Garrett Park, MD 20896

MINUTES

Meeting Call to Order: Mayor Shawaker called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM. Present were Councilmembers Berry, Hansen, Irons, Mandel, and Wegner. Also present was Administrator Pratt, Larry Johnson & Richard Travers of VIEW Engineering, former Councilmembers Peter Benjamin and Dick Pratt.

Approval of Agenda: The Agenda was approved as amended without objection.

Discussion:

Peter Benjamin gave a broad overview of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), the process through which it was developed and the contents of the draft currently before the Council. Mr. Benjamin noted that the current draft did not include a complete inventory of the Town's capital assets, stating condition, timing of necessary repairs, improvements, and replacements, with recommendations and estimated costs, as called for in the Statement of Work. Mr. Johnson agreed to add the inventory to the CIP draft as soon as possible. Mr. Benjamin also noted that the CIP was an on-going process with a 20-year horizon that envisioned an average annual investment of approximately \$200,000, and that it would require updating at regular intervals - most likely every 5 years.

Larry Johnson then discussed the methodology that VIEW had used to develop cost estimates. Mr. Johnson stated that the \$200,000 per year average would require a number of projects to be staged over multiple years, that the major review every 5 years was advisable, and that particular attention needed to be paid to planning funding. He further noted that an alternative to pay-as-you-go year by year would be to consolidate a project or projects into a bond issue so that they could be completed in one effort, the current cost locked in, and payment made while benefits of the improvements were enjoyed by the residents. There was extended discussion on funding.

Mayor Shawaker then asked Mr. Johnson and Mr. Travers to review the draft CIP section by section and respond to questions, which they did at length.

Resident Dick Pratt provided some history of previous road projects, noting that unanticipated problems with inadequate roadbed had caused great difficulty and significantly increased costs in the resurfacing of the southern part of Kenilworth Avenue. He used this as an example of the need to maintain year-to-year flexibility in the street program, not committing in advance to a massive milling and repaving program, and to extend the life of existing pavements as long as possible with treatments such as the street sealing recently applied by Montgomery County in the Kensington Parkwood area. Mr. Pratt stated that he much preferred a pay-as-you-go program of street upkeep, feeling that it would be more fiscally responsible than a bond issue as well as more flexible in responding to maintenance needs and unexpected expenses that become apparent over time. The representatives of VIEW Engineering disagreed with Mr. Pratt on the efficacy of roadway sealing treatments.

Councilmember Berry also expressed reservations about the scope and content of the VIEW report. Specifically, he felt that additional strategies for the streets program should be considered, and he outlined several of them. In support of his recommendations, he cited the experience of other towns. (See "Street Major Maintenance Study" Town of Woodbury, MN, November 19, 2002; this study is on file at the Town office but not appended to these minutes.) Councilmember Berry raised a number of additional items, which are the subject of a memorandum that he prepared and is attached to these minutes.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted

[TOWN SEAL]

Edwin Pratt, Jr.

Edwin Pratt, Jr., Clerk

Attachments

January 23, 2008

To: The Town of Garrett Park
From: Charles Berry, Councilmember
Subject: Asset Survey and Capital Improvements Plan
Prepared by VIEW Engineering
Draft – October 2007

My comments on the subject CIP are:

ROADWAYS

1. page 4, paragraph 1 – “The pavement section that VIEW recommends for resurfacing is a fabric overlay with 2 inches bituminous concrete surface (asphalt).”

The statement above does not mention milling yet Section II has a details a “Roadway Rehabilitation” strategy for every road in town that shows “2011: Total Milling and Overlay”. The recommendation from VIEW should be clarified. Is the recommendation “a fabric overlay with 2 inches bituminous concrete surface (asphalt)”, or “Total Milling and Overlay”. If it is “Total Milling and Overlay” does this include fabric?

Also this item is even more confusing when looking at APPENDIX “C” where the first detail is confusing. It should be clarified to show if it is for the existing road condition of the proposed recommendation of fabric and 2” overlay. It implies to me that the existing road is not to be milled since it shows two 2” bituminous surfaces courses.

2. A simple search on Google with keywords such as “roads, sealer, overlay” quickly provides studies and plans with road rehabilitation strategies developed by a number of towns and local governments. These plans show that the existing roads were inspected and rated as was done by VIEW. Most of the plans then recommend rehabilitation strategies ranging from Do Nothing for roads in good shape to Total Replacement. In between these tow strategies are Sealers, Overlay only, and Milling an Overlay depending on the rating of amount of deterioration that has occurred in the road.

It appears the roads in Garrett Park fall under the same scenarios of roads elsewhere where the roadway is in very good condition (the portion of Kenilworth in front of Town Hall that was totally replaced, to good condition (like many of the roads south of Strathmore – side with Town Hall) to fair to poor condition on some roads.

What does VIEW not include a sealer option in their recommendations for roads in town that are in good condition when this strategy is used in many other towns and areas including Montgomery County and the City of Rockville?

3. If the Town of Garrett Park were to use a sealer on roads that are in good condition, what would the cost savings be as compared to “milling and overlay on all roads”?

4. What is the life of a road that has a sealer vs. a road that is milled and receives fabric and overlay?

5. What other towns or local governments use the mill/fabric/overlay strategy that VIEW has recommended?

6. Provide the resumes of the representatives at VIEW who have recommended the road rehabilitation strategy.

7. Provide the Scope of Work the VIEW is to provide.

8. Were pavement boring samples obtained?

9. On Rokeby Ave in front of my house at 11016 Rokeby Ave. was recently cut and patched by WSSC. It appeared the pavement was only about 3” to 4” thick. Will a road of this thickness be able to be milled 2” without tearing up the remaining pavement? What is the minimum thickness the existing pavement should be to be able to accept a milling to remove 2” of pavement?

10. I understand that there have been two other studies of the roads in town performed. Did VIEW review these studies? Please provide these studies.

SIDEWALKS AND PATHWAYS

1. Who in “The Town expressed an interest in possibly constructing sidewalks throughout the Town”?

STORM WATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES

1. page 7 - A “drainage issue at Montrose and Clermont Ave arose” and “This is still an open issue”. I understand that the issue was related to a blocked storm drain inlet and has been resolved. The town budgets have included \$70,000 for this item that I am told is no longer an issue. What is the issue as VIEW understands it. This is not described by VIEW in their draft plan.

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

1. page 7, last paragraph - “Tennis Courts and Swimming Pool at Cambria Park” - “The tennis courts are in good condition at present.” The court is

reported to sit atop an old water tank are and settles over time causing a crack in the court.

STREET LIGHTING

1. The town does own the roadway.
2. Most of the streetlights were replaced but not all. It would be good to include the remaining lights to be replaced in the CIP.

BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT

1.4th paragraph – Town Hall – “The Town Hall roof is asphalt shingle type roof. These roofs typically last 20-25 years. The current roof has been in place for 7 years.” This means the roof may need to be replaced in 13 to 18 years if it is assume the shingles are 20-25 year shingles. Section C – page 52 – Town Hall – consider adding replacing the roof.

Other Items:

1. Penn Place Parking Lot Improvements are not included in the CIP.

end